



UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE

United States Patent and Trademark Office

Address: COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS

P.O. Box 1450

Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1450

www.uspto.gov

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.
10/582,435	06/09/2006	Rene L. Cruz	0321.68813	4864
24978 7590 06/09/2009 GREER, BURNS & CRAIN 300 S WACKER DR 25TH FLOOR CHICAGO, IL 60606				
EXAMINER				
ABDALLA, KHALID M				
ART UNIT		PAPER NUMBER		
2419				
MAIL DATE		DELIVERY MODE		
06/09/2009		PAPER		

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

The time period for reply, if any, is set in the attached communication.

Office Action Summary

Application No.

10/582,435

Applicant(s)

CRUZ, RENE L.

Examiner

KHALID ABDALLA

Art Unit

2419

Period for Reply -- The MAILING DATE of this communication appears on the cover sheet with the correspondence address --

A SHORTENED STATUTORY PERIOD FOR REPLY IS SET TO EXPIRE 3 MONTH(S) OR THIRTY (30) DAYS, WHICHEVER IS LONGER, FROM THE MAILING DATE OF THIS COMMUNICATION.

- Extensions of time may be available under the provisions of 37 CFR 1.136(a). In no event, however, may a reply be timely filed after SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- If NO period for reply is specified above, the maximum statutory period will apply and will expire SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- Failure to reply within the set or extended period for reply will, by statute, cause the application to become ABANDONED (35 U.S.C. § 133). Any reply received by the Office later than three months after the mailing date of this communication, even if timely filed, may reduce any earned patent term adjustment. See 37 CFR 1.704(b).

Status

- 1) ☒ Responsive to communication(s) filed on 09 June 2006.
- 2a) ☐ This action is **FINAL**. 2b) ☒ This action is non-final.
- 3) ☐ Since this application is in condition for allowance except for formal matters, prosecution as to the merits is closed in accordance with the practice under *Ex parte Quayle*, 1935 C.D. 11, 453 O.G. 213.

Disposition of Claims

- 4) ☒ Claim(s) 1-27 is/are pending in the application.
- 4a) Of the above claim(s) _____ is/are withdrawn from consideration.
- 5) ☐ Claim(s) _____ is/are allowed.
- 6) ☒ Claim(s) 1-27 is/are rejected.
- 7) ☒ Claim(s) 10, 20 and 27 is/are objected to.
- 8) ☐ Claim(s) _____ are subject to restriction and/or election requirement.

Application Papers

- 9) ☐ The specification is objected to by the Examiner.
- 10) ☐ The drawing(s) filed on _____ is/are: a) ☐ accepted or b) ☐ objected to by the Examiner.
Applicant may not request that any objection to the drawing(s) be held in abeyance. See 37 CFR 1.85(a).
Replacement drawing sheet(s) including the correction is required if the drawing(s) is objected to. See 37 CFR 1.121(d).
- 11) ☐ The oath or declaration is objected to by the Examiner. Note the attached Office Action or form PTO-152.

Priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119

- 12) ☒ Acknowledgment is made of a claim for foreign priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119(a)-(d) or (f).
- a) ☒ All b) ☐ Some * c) ☐ None of:
1. ☒ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received.
 2. ☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received in Application No. _____.
 3. ☐ Copies of the certified copies of the priority documents have been received in this National Stage application from the International Bureau (PCT Rule 17.2(a)).

* See the attached detailed Office action for a list of the certified copies not received.

Attachment(s)

- 1) ☒ Notice of References Cited (PTO-892)
- 2) ☐ Notice of Draftperson's Patent Drawing Review (PTO-948)
- 3) ☒ Information Disclosure Statement(s) (PTO/SI/100)
Paper No(s)/Mail Date 03/09/2009 AND 06/09/2006
- 4) ☐ Interview Summary (PTO-413)
Paper No(s)/Mail Date: _____
- 5) ☐ Notice of Informal Patent Application
- 6) ☐ Other: _____

DETAILED ACTION

Claim Objections

1. Claim 10, 20 and 27 are objected to under 37 CFR 1.75(c) because of the following informalities:

Regarding claims 10, the phrase " a device outside the network of clients " in line 1 seems to refer back to " a device outside of the network of clients " in claim5, lines 2 .If this is true it's suggested to change " a device outside the network of clients " to " the device outside of the network of clients "

Regarding claim 20, the phrase " a device outside the community of clients " in line 1 seems to refer back to " a device outside of the community of clients " in claim 15 lines 2. If this is true it's suggested to change " a device outside the community of clients " to " the device outside of the community of clients ".

Regarding claim 27, " a gateway device " in line 1 seems to refer back to " a gateway device " in claim 22, line 1. If this is true it's suggested to change "a gateway device " to " the gateway device ".

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 102

2. The following is a quotation of the appropriate paragraphs of 35 U.S.C. 102 that form the basis for the rejections under this section made in this Office action:

A person shall be entitled to a patent unless –

(b) The invention was patented or described in a printed publication in this or a foreign country or in public use or on sale in this country, more than one year prior to the date of application for patent in the United States.

3. Claim1-7, 9 and 11-12 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 102(b) as being anticipated by Li et al (US-PAT 6119162).

Regarding claim 1 Li et al discloses a method for providing shared communication resource access (proxy server software permits all of the computers on LAN 10 to share public telephone line 18 and access ISP see co1:5 line 1-5 and FIG 1), the method comprising steps of:

establishing a network of clients (LAN 10 includes plurality of computers 'clients' see FIG 1), wherein at least a plurality of the clients in the network of clients have a their own associated communication resource connection (some of computers 12 may be connected to ISP 16 through, for example, a cable line, while others of computers 12 are connected to ISP 16 through public telephone lines 18. Other configurations having multiple public telephone lines may also be used. With multiple telephone lines, it is possible to have more than one active server, and each of the client computers may select one of the active servers to reroute its Internet traffic see coln: 5 lines 59-67). providing a communication protocol between the network of clients ;

providing a protocol for sharing the communication resource connections of the at least some of the clients to the network of clients (proxy server software permits all of the computers on LAN 10 to share public telephone line 18 and access ISP and that also inherent providing a protocol see co1:5 line 1-5 and FIG 1); and

spreading communications from a client in the network of clients among the communication resource connections of the at least a plurality of the clients in the network (Additionally, if there are multiple active servers, each computer may route

network traffic through more than one active server to increase network bandwidth see coln:12 lines 29-37).

Regarding claim 2 Li et al discloses wherein the communication protocol between the network comprises a wireless protocol that is implemented via a wireless medium (LAN 10 on FIG 1 could also comprise connections made via power lines, telephone lines, wireless connections made via infrared or RF transmission or any other type of network connection that inherent wireless protocol see cool: 6 line 8-14).

Regarding claim 3 Li et al discloses The method, wherein the communication resource access comprises Internet access (proxy server software permits all of the computers on LAN 10 to share public telephone line 18 and access ISP see co1:5 line 1-5 and FIG 1) and the communication resource connections of the network of clients comprise Internet access connections (Typically, computers 12 will establish a connection to the Internet (or other WAN) by connecting to ISP 16 through public telephone line 18. Because LAN 10 is being used in a home or small office, all of computers 12 share a single public telephone line 18, so only one of computers 12 may use its modem to connect to ISP 16 (or any other service) at any given time see coln:4 lines 49-55)

Regarding claim 4, Li et al discloses the method, wherein the network of clients comprises a wireless community (LAN 10 on FIG 1 could also comprise connections made via power lines, telephone lines, wireless connections made via infrared or RF transmission or any other type of network connection see cool: 6 line 8-14)

Regarding claim 5, Li et al discloses the method, wherein the steps of providing a protocol for sharing comprises:

accepting client session requests for a session with a device outside of the network of clients; and providing a proxy between the device outside of the network of clients and a client requesting a client session (Computers on the LAN are configured to send their requests to the proxy server software running on one particular computer on the network. The proxy server software then sends the request to the appropriate place on the Internet, receives any response, and sends the response back to the appropriate computer on the LAN. Thus, the proxy server interposes itself in every communication between a computer on the LAN and the Internet see coln: 2 lines 32-37) also see coln: 4 lines 61-67 and coln: 5 lines 1-11 disclose all the claim limitations).

Regarding claim 6, Li et al discloses the method, wherein the step of spreading comprises choosing one of the Internet access connections based upon usage patterns (if there are multiple telephone lines, the server selection agent software may be altered to handle more than one active server, and the state that searches for active servers may determine which or the active servers to use based on the load at each active server. Additionally, if there are multiple active servers, each computer may route network traffic through more than one active server to increase network bandwidth see coln: 12 lines 29-33).

Regarding claim 7, Li et al discloses the method of, wherein the step of spreading is conducted on a packet basis (Additionally, if there are multiple active servers, each computer may route network traffic through more than one active server to increase

network bandwidth , routing internet traffic that inherent packet basis see coln:12 lines 34-37)

Regarding claim 9, Li et al discloses the method, wherein the step of providing a proxy is implemented by a device within the network of clients (The development of gateway software, however, such as network address translation software or proxy server software, permits all of the computers on LAN 10 to share public telephone line 18 and access to ISP 16. The gateway software usually is installed on one of computers 12, which then functions as a designated server. All of the other computers 12 and computer 19 are configured to route any traffic to the Internet through the designated server containing the gateway software see coln: 4 lines 66-67 and coln: 5 lines 1-7).

Regarding claim 11, Li et al discloses the method the, wherein the step of providing a proxy is implemented by a device accessed through the Internet (Computers on the LAN are configured to send their requests to the proxy server software running on one particular computer on the network. The proxy server software then sends the request to the appropriate place on the Internet, receives any response, and sends the response back to the appropriate computer on the LAN. Thus, the proxy server interposes itself in every communication between a computer on the LAN and the Internet see coln: 2 lines 32-37) also see coln: 4 lines 61-67 and coln: 5 lines 1-11 discloses all the claim limitations)

Regarding claim 12, Li et al discloses The method, wherein the step of providing a proxy is implemented by a device within an Internet service provider that serves the

network of clients (Typically, computers 12 will establish a connection to the Internet (or other WAN) by connecting to ISP 16 through public telephone line 18. Because LAN 10 is being used in a home or small office, all of computers 12 share a single public telephone line 18, so only one of computers 12 may use its modem to connect to ISP 16 (or any other service) at any given time see coln:4 lines 49-55).

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 103

4. The following is a quotation of 35 U.S.C. 103(a) which forms the basis for all obviousness rejections set forth in this Office action:

(a) A patent may not be obtained though the invention is not identically disclosed or described as set forth in section 102 of this title, if the differences between the subject matter sought to be patented and the prior art are such that the subject matter as a whole would have been obvious at the time the invention was made to a person having ordinary skill in the art to which said subject matter pertains. Patentability shall not be negated by the manner in which the invention was made.

5. Claims 8, 13- 19 and 21-26 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Li et al (US-PAT 6119162) in view of Vange (US 20020002618 A1).

Regarding claim 8 Li et al does not disclose the method, wherein the step of spreading is conducted on a session basis. Vange from the same or similar field of endeavor teach (Client traffic is dynamically directed to available front-ends 201 to provide load balancing. Hence, when quality of service drops because of a large number of client accesses, an additional front-end 201 can be assigned to the web site and subsequent client requests directed to the newly assigned front-end 201 to distribute traffic across a broader base see [0042] lines 9-15). Thus it would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art to implement the method of Vange in the system of Li et al. The method of Li et al can be implemented on any type of method wherein the step of spreading is conducted on a session basis which is taught by

Vange .The motivation for using this is to provide efficient prioritizing data traffic system over a shared bandwidth connection.

Regarding claim 13 Li discloses a method for providing shared Internet access (proxy server software permits all of the computers on LAN 10 to share public telephone line 18 and access ISP see co1:5 line 1-5 and FIG 1).

Li does not discloses pooling the Internet access connections of a community of clients into a resource available for bursts of traffics to a client in the community of clients by a network medium and protocol shared among the groups of clients; and dividing bursts of traffic to or from a client of the community of clients across the Internet access connections created by the step of pooling. However Vange teaches pooling the Internet access (A particular last-mile communication system may be statically associated with a front-end server so that all communication entering and leaving the last-mile interface goes through the associated front-end server.Alternatively, a redirection mechanism is enabled to select from a pool of available front-end servers and client request-response traffic is conducted through the selected front-end server see [0022] lines 1-7) connections of a community of clients into a resource available for bursts of traffics to a client in the community of clients by a network medium and protocol shared among the groups of clients; and dividing burst of traffic (Client traffic is dynamically directed to available front-ends 201 to provide load balancing see[0042]) to or from a client of the community of clients across the Internet access connections created by the step of pooling (a redirection mechanism is enabled to select from a pool of available front-end servers and client request-response traffic is conducted

through the selected front-end server see [0022]) to or from a client of the community of clients across the Internet access connections created by the step of pooling (The front-end server implements a mechanism for discriminating between request and/or response packets communicated with the last-mile communication system. In the case of outgoing traffic (i.e., originating from the last-mile interface), the front-end preferably buffers and/or reorders requests before transmitting them over the Internet. In the case of incoming traffic (i.e., originating from the Internet), the front-end server implements a mechanism for buffering and/or reordering response packets before they are transmitted over the last-mile interface see [0020]lines 8-17 and [0022]lines 1-7). Thus it would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to use and modify the disclosure of Li and couple it with the pool of available front-end servers taught by Vange in order to load balance the traffic across the network.

Regarding claim 14, note that Li discloses the method, wherein the community of clients comprises a local wireless area network (LAN 10 on FIG 1 could also comprise connections made via power lines, telephone lines, wireless connections made via infrared or RF transmission or any other type of network connection see coln: 6 line 8-14).

Regarding claim 15 note that Li et al discloses the method, further comprising steps of:
accepting client session requests for a session with a device outside of the community of clients; and providing a proxy between the device outside of the network of clients

and a client requesting a client session (Computers on the LAN are configured to send their requests to the proxy server software running on one particular computer on the network. The proxy server software then sends the request to the appropriate place on the Internet, receives any response, and sends the response back to the appropriate computer on the LAN. Thus, the proxy server interposes itself in every communication between a computer on the LAN and the Internet see coln: 2 lines 32-37) also see coln: 4 lines 61-67 and coln: 5 lines 1-11 discloses all the claim limitations)

Regarding claim 16 note that Li et al discloses the method, wherein the step of dividing comprises choosing one of the Internet access connections based upon usage patterns (if there are multiple telephone lines, the server selection agent software may be altered to handle more than one active server, and the state that searches for active servers may determine which or the active servers to use based on the load at each active server. Additionally, if there are multiple active servers, each computer may route network traffic through more than one active server to increase network bandwidth see coln: 12 lines 29-33)

Regarding claim 17 note that Li et al discloses the method, wherein the step of choosing is conducted on a packet basis (the server selection agent software may be altered to handle more than one active server, and the state that searches for active servers may determine which or the active servers to use based on the load at each active server. Additionally, if there are multiple active servers, each computer may route network traffic through more than one active server to increase network bandwidth, routing internet traffic that inherent packet basis see coln: 12 lines 34-37)

Regarding claim 18 note that Vange teaches the method, wherein the step of choosing is conducted on a session basis (Client traffic is dynamically directed to available front-ends 201 to provide load balancing. Hence, when quality of service drops because of a large number of client accesses, an additional front-end 201 can be assigned to the web site and subsequent client requests directed to the newly assigned front-end 201 to distribute traffic across a broader base see [0042] lines 9-15)

Regarding claim 19 note that Li et al discloses the method, wherein the step of providing a proxy is implemented by a device within the network of clients (The development of gateway software, however, such as network address translation software or proxy server software, permits all of the computers on LAN 10 to share public telephone line 18 and access to ISP 16. The gateway software usually is installed on one of computers 12, which then functions as a designated server. All of the other computers 12 and computer 19 are configured to route any traffic to the Internet through the designated server containing the gateway software see coln: 4 lines 66-67 and coln: 5 lines 1-7).

Regarding claim 21 note that Li et al discloses the method of, wherein the step of providing a proxy is implemented by a device accessed through the Internet (Computers on the LAN are configured to send their requests to the proxy server software running on one particular computer on the network. The proxy server software then sends the request to the appropriate place on the Internet, receives any response, and sends the response back to the appropriate computer on the LAN. Thus, the proxy server interposes itself in every communication between a computer on the LAN

and the Internet see coln: 2 lines 32-37) also see coln: 4 lines 61-67 and clon: 5 lines 1-11 discloses all the claim limitations)

Regarding claim 22, Li et al discloses a gateway device (one of computers 12 in FIG. 1) implemented in software stored on a computer readable medium or hardware (the gateway software usually is installed on one of computers 12, which then functions as a designated server see co1:5 lines 3-5) that performs steps of:
redirecting requests from a client of the gateway device to a proxy (All of the other computers are configured to route any traffic to the Internet through the designated server containing the gateway software see co1:5 line 5-7).

Li et al does not disclose maintaining communications with other gateway devices in a client community via a medium utilized by the community.

participating in selecting from among a plurality of communication resources in the community. Vange from the same or similar field of endeavor teach maintaining communications with other gateway devices (wireless interface e.g. component 215 FIG2) in a client community via a medium utilized by the community (wireless interface 215 of FIG. 2 communicate with clients 205 wirelessly)

participating in selecting from among a plurality of communication resources in the community (the front-end server 201 handles communication with originating servers or other network servers that contain the information and resources that are the subject of each request see [0023] and FIG2). Thus it would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art to implement the method of Vange in the system of LI et al. The method of Li et al can be implemented on any type of method wherein maintaining

communications with other gateway devices in a client community via a medium utilized by the community participating in selecting from among a plurality of communication resources in the community which is taught by Vange with a motivation in order to provide efficient prioritizing data traffic system over a shared bandwidth connections.

Regarding claim 23, note that Li discloses the gateway device, wherein the communication resources comprise Internet access resources (Fig. 1, the computers of LAN 10 access the internet via the public lines 18 also the gateway software usually is installed on one of computers 12, which then functions as a designated server. All of the other computers 12 and computer 19 are configured to route any traffic to the Internet through the designated server containing the gateway software see coln: 5 lines 3-7)

Regarding claim 24, note that Li discloses the gateway device, wherein the gateway device further performs the step of forwarding packets for other clients in the community to an appropriate gateway device in the community (a front-end 201 couples directly to a wireless network interface 215. In another example, a front-end 201 couples directly to a cable head end unit 225 that feeds multiple clients 205 see [0032] also response data packets arriving at the front-end 201 from the Internet are associated with a prioritization value supplied by, for example, the web site owner. The enhanced channel 202 is important in this implementation to provide a ready mechanism to communicate this prioritization value to the front-end 201. In another embodiment, front-end 201 determines a priority value based on a user identification

and/or content type and/or other criteria that it can determine from a request packet received from the last-mile connection see [003] lines 4-13)

Regarding claim 25 note that Vange discloses the gateway device, wherein the plurality of communication resources comprises comprise separate communication resource accounts of clients in the community of clients (Each front-end 201 includes data structures for storing the configuration information, including information identifying the IP addresses of web servers 210 to which they are currently assigned. Other administrative and configuration information stored in front-end 201 may include information for prioritizing data from and to particular clients, quality of service information, and the like see [0043] lines 4-11).

Regarding claim 26 note that Vange discloses the gateway device, wherein the separate communication resource accounts of clients comprise separate Internet access accounts (FIG. 2 illustrates a private network 200 implemented within the Internet infrastructure. Private network 200 expedites and prioritizes communications between a client 205 and a web site 210. In the specific examples herein clients 205 comprises client software that can access a standard or proprietary user level protocol for network access see [0030] lines 1-7).

6. The following is a quotation of 35 U.S.C. 103(a) which forms the basis for all obviousness rejections set forth in this Office action:

(a) A patent may not be obtained though the invention is not identically disclosed or described as set forth in section 102 of this title, if the differences between the subject matter sought to be patented and the prior art are such that the subject matter as a whole would have been obvious at the time the invention was made to a person having ordinary skill in the art to which said subject matter pertains. Patentability shall not be negated by the manner in which the invention was made.

Claim 10 is rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Li et al (US-PAT 6119162) in view of Prokop (US- PAT 6870848) .

Regarding claim 10, Li et al does not disclose the method of, wherein the step of providing a proxy is implemented by a device outside the network of clients. Prokop from the same or similar field of endeavor teach (One capability provided by the CPC system 20 is the ability to present one or a relatively small number of telephone numbers or other identifiers to the outside world (outside the community 26). A call originated from an outside network element and directed to a telephone number or address associated with the community 26 is processed by the CPC system 20. The CPC system 20 accepts the call and determines based on information in the call request or further input or information from the calling entity, which of the network elements in the community 26 is to be involved in the call session see coln: 3 lines 27-37). Thus it would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art to implement the method of Prokop in the system of Li et al. The method of Li et al can be implemented on any type of method, wherein the step of providing a proxy is implemented by a device outside the network of clients which is taught by Prokop with a motivation to establish an efficient packet base data network including call processing system that can reconnect or forward the call to the agent.

7. The following is a quotation of 35 U.S.C. 103(a) which forms the basis for all obviousness rejections set forth in this Office action:

(a) A patent may not be obtained though the invention is not identically disclosed or described as set forth in section 102 of this title, if the differences between the subject matter sought to be patented and the prior art are such that the subject matter as a whole would have been obvious at the time the

invention was made to a person having ordinary skill in the art to which said subject matter pertains. Patentability shall not be negated by the manner in which the invention was made.

Claim 20 is rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Li et al (US-PAT 6119162) in view of Vange (US 20020002618 A1) as applied to claim 15 above and further in view of Prokop (US- PAT 6870848).

Regarding claim 20, Li et al and Vange does not disclose the method, wherein the step of providing a proxy is implemented by a device outside the community of clients. Prokop from the same or similar field of endeavor teach (One capability provided by the CPC system 20 is the ability to present one or a relatively small number of telephone numbers or other identifiers to the outside world (outside the community 26). A call originated from an outside network element and directed to a telephone number or address associated with the community 26 is processed by the CPC system 20. The CPC system 20 accepts the call and determines based on information in the call request or further input or information from the calling entity, which of the network elements in the community 26 is to be involved in the call session see coln: 3 lines 27-37). Thus it would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art to implement the method of Prokop in the system of Li et al and Vange. The method of Li et al and Vange can be implemented on any type of method, wherein the step of providing a proxy is implemented by a device outside the community of clients which is taught by Prokop with a motivation to establish an efficient packet base data network including call processing system that can reconnect or forward the call to the agent.

8. The following is a quotation of 35 U.S.C. 103(a) which forms the basis for all obviousness rejections set forth in this Office action:

(a) A patent may not be obtained though the invention is not identically disclosed or described as set forth in section 102 of this title, if the differences between the subject matter sought to be patented and the prior art are such that the subject matter as a whole would have been obvious at the time the invention was made to a person having ordinary skill in the art to which said subject matter pertains. Patentability shall not be negated by the manner in which the invention was made.

Claim 27 is rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Li et al (US-PAT 6119162) in view of Vange (US 20020002618 A1) as applied to claim 22 above and further in view of Prokop (US- PAT 6870848).

Regarding claim 27, Li et al and Vange does not discloses a remote proxy server to receive redirected requests from a gateway device. Prokop from the same or similar field of endeavor teach (One capability provided by the CPC system 20 is the ability to present one or a relatively small number of telephone numbers or other identifiers to the outside world (outside the community 26). A call originated from an outside network element and directed to a telephone number or address associated with the community 26 is processed by the CPC system 20. The CPC system 20 accepts the call and determines based on information in the call request or further input or information from the calling entity, which of the network elements in the community 26 is to be involved in the call session see coin: 3 lines 27-37). Thus it would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art to implement the method of Prokop in the system of Li et al and Vange. The method of Li et al and Vange can be implemented on any type of method wherein a remote proxy server to receive redirected requests from a gateway device which is taught by Prokop with a motivation to establish an efficient packet base data network including call processing system that can reconnect or forward the call to the agent.

Conclusion

9. The prior art made of record and not relied upon is considered pertinent to applicant's disclosure.

(US-PAT-NO 6968394), (EL-Rafie) discloses Asymmetric satellite-based internet service.

10. Any inquiry concerning this communication or earlier communications from the examiner should be directed to KHALID ABDALLA whose telephone number is (571)270-7526. The examiner can normally be reached on Monday - Friday.

If attempts to reach the examiner by telephone are unsuccessful, the examiner's supervisor, Dang Ton can be reached on 571-272-3171. The fax phone number for the organization where this application or proceeding is assigned is 571-273-8300.

Information regarding the status of an application may be obtained from the Patent Application Information Retrieval (PAIR) system. Status information for published applications may be obtained from either Private PAIR or Public PAIR. Status information for unpublished applications is available through Private PAIR only. For more information about the PAIR system, see <http://pair-direct.uspto.gov>. Should you have questions on access to the Private PAIR system, contact the Electronic Business Center (EBC) at 866-217-9197 (toll-free). If you would like assistance from a USPTO Customer Service Representative or access to the automated information system, call 800-786-9199 (IN USA OR CANADA) or 571-272-1000.

/K. A./
Examiner, Art Unit 2419

Art Unit: 2419

/DANG T TON/

Supervisory Patent Examiner, Art Unit 2419/D. T. T./

Supervisory Patent Examiner, Art Unit 2419